much more on the needs of rural America than you can the Commerce Department. That's why we put the additional money in. And to take \$400 million out of the Agriculture Department now would be a major mistake if you care about the future economic health of rural America.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

You know, I think this is truly about the economic revitalization of a part of the country that has been so sorely lacking, and the application process—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to my friend to finish her sentence.

Ms. DELAURO. Well, I was just saying that the process on the economic recovery package, the application process is underway. It began at the beginning of this month. That money is going out. The demand is up for broadband. Let's give rural America a fighting chance.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this, representing a very rural district, a district where you can't get cell phone coverage, and a lot of the wireless technology is in already, I support what is going on. I agree with the chairman; it would have been nice for all of the money to go into RUS and not the Department of Commerce because it was an existing infrastructure for making this loan program.

The only thing I am saying is you don't get the new money until you have spent the existing money.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. Kosmas) having assumed the chair, Mr. Snyder, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2997) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 88b-3, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair

announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the House of Representatives Page Board:

Mr. KILDEE, Michigan Ms. DEGETTE, Colorado

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 2, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 88b-3, amended by section 2 of the House Page Board Revision Act of 2007, I am pleased to re-appoint the Honorable Rob Bishop of Utah and the Honorable Virginia Foxx of North Carolina to the Page Board. Both Mr. Bishop and Mrs. Foxx have expressed interest in serving in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill their requests.

Sincerely,

John A. Boehner, Republican Leader.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 88b-3, amended by section 2 of the House Page Board Revision Act of 2007, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's and minority leader's joint reappointment of the following individuals to the House of Representatives Page Board for a term of 1 year, effective July 8, 2009:

Ms. Lynn Silversmith Klein of Maryland

Mr. Adam Jones of Michigan

HEALTH CARE DEBATE

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. As we approach this debate on health care, there are Republican principles that have been out there a long time that are going to be followed this week by legislation. One of those principles is to ensure that medical decisions are made by patients and doctors, not by government bureaucrats.

I am going to insert in the RECORD an article from yesterday's Wall Street Journal. The title is "Of NICE and Men," NICE being the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence in Great Britain. And this article talks about what happens when you have rationed care.

Great Britain has one of the lowest survival rates in Europe from cancer. And in Europe generally, if you compare Europe to the United States, breast cancer survivors, 84 percent in the United States, 73 percent in Europe; prostate cancer survivors, 92 percent in the United States, 57 percent in Europe.

People need to have more choices, not less choices. We need a more competitive marketplace, not a less competitive marketplace. A government competitor will drive away all other competitors. That will be a critical part of this debate.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 7, 2009] OF NICE AND MEN

Speaking to the American Medical Association last month, President Obama waxed enthusiastic about countries that "spend less" than the U.S. on health care. He's right that many countries do, but what he doesn't want to explain is how they ration care to do it.

Take the United Kingdom, which is often praised for spending as little as half as much per capita on health care as the U.S. Credit for this cost containment goes in large part to the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, or NICE. Americans should understand how NICE works because under ObamaCare it will eventually be coming to a hospital near you.

The British officials who established NICE in the late 1990s pitched it as a body that would ensure that the government-run National Health System used "best practices" in medicine. As the Guardian reported in 1998: "Health ministers are setting up [NICE], designed to ensure that every treatment, operation, or medicine used is the proven best. It will root out under-performing doctors and useless treatments, spreading best practices everywhere."

What NICE has become in practice is a rationing board. As health costs have exploded in Britain as in most developed countries, NICE has become the heavy that reduces spending by limiting the treatments that 61 million citizens are allowed to receive through the NHS. For example:

In March, NICE ruled against the use of two drugs, Lapatinib and Sutent, that prolong the life of those with certain forms of breast and stomach cancer. This followed on a 2008 ruling against drugs—including Sutent, which costs about \$50,000—that would help terminally ill kidney-cancer patients. After last year's ruling, Peter Littlejohns, NICE's clinical and public health director, noted that "there is a limited pot of money," that the drugs were of "marginal benefit at quite often an extreme cost," and the money might be better spent elsewhere.

In 2007, the board restricted access to two drugs for macular degeneration, a cause of blindness. The drug Macugen was blocked outright. The other, Lucentis, was limited to a particular category of individuals with the disease, restricting it to about one in five sufferers. Even then, the drug was only approved for use in one eye, meaning those lucky enough to get it would still go blind in the other. As Andrew Dillon, the chief executive of NICE, explained at the time: "When treatments are very expensive, we have to patients."

NICE has limited the use of Alzheimer's drugs, including Aricept, for patients in the early stages of the disease. Doctors in the U.K. argued vociferously that the most effective way to slow the progress of the disease is to give drugs at the first sign of dementia. NICE ruled the drugs were not "cost effective" in early stages.

Other NICE rulings include the rejection of Kineret, a drug for rheumatoid arthritis; Avonex, which reduces the relapse rate in patients with multiple sclerosis; and